

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,

1884.

I. — *The Genitive Case in Sophokles.*

BY THOMAS D. GOODELL, PH. D.,

PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL, HARTFORD, CONN.

I.

ON pedagogical as well as on other grounds the uses of the Greek genitive need to be more thoroughly understood, and more clearly presented in the elementary grammars; for no department of Greek syntax is more productive of confusion of thought in young pupils. The grammars most in use differ greatly in their classification and in the statement of principles. Here, as elsewhere, categories based originally on mistaken notions are still retained, for the supposed comfort of the learner, after their reason for existence has long been recognized as illusory. Careful statement, with accompanying statistics, of the actual usage of the case, from Homer down, is urgently needed. It is the aim of this paper to give such a statement with reference to Sophokles. The classification employed will be different in some respects from others which have been widely adopted; and will be more or less superior to them, it is hoped, because according more closely with the historical development of the case. And, in particular, the ablatival uses of the genitive will be shown to be more numerous, and in some directions more clearly defined, in Sophokles at least, than the grammars would lead one to suppose.

Before proceeding farther, a word may be said in regard to certain restrictions adhered to in this paper, and in regard to the method of recording the facts observed. In the first

place, the fragments are not included in this survey, except incidentally. And this for two reasons: chiefly because they offer nothing which would materially affect the conclusions derived from the rest of Sophokles, but also because to include them would require an entirely disproportionate amount of textual discussion. What we are seeking now is primarily the general proportions of Sophoklean usage. The entire plays give these sufficiently, even if the text of the fragments did not present special difficulties. But the ratio of doubtful or corrupt lines to sound ones in the fragments is of course much the greater; and it would not be worth while to make elaborate studies of the text of the worst lines in an author — especially when the investigator's decisions would carry with them no weight unless accompanied by a full account of his reasoning — merely in order to determine whether a given construction, common everywhere, occurs, say, three hundred or three hundred and one times. A few points of special interest in the fragments will be mentioned in their natural connection. In the entire plays, also, variations in text are not touched upon, except where the usage is peculiar, or where a single example would affect statistics considerably. The text followed is that of Schneidewin as revised by Nauck, and references are made to the following editions of the separate plays: Ai., 7th ed., 1877; O. T., 7th ed., 1876; O. K., 7th ed., 1878; Ant., 8th ed., 1880; El., 5th ed., 1877; Tr., 5th ed., 1880; Phil., 7th ed., 1876. Lyric references — that is, to all lines not in trimeter or tetrameter dialogue — are distinguished by heavy-faced numerals. Further, the genitives themselves are counted, not the governing words; a word attracted into the genitive is counted and assigned to the governing word on which the attracting genitive depends; but appositives are not counted.

In any study of the Greek genitive we must constantly recognize the fact that a part of the Indo-European ablative has become identical with it in form. So far as can be done with certainty, or with a high degree of probability, these cases should be separated, and treated as two. It is true, before the language reached that stage which appears in Homer

the union had become, in some common constructions, so complete that the line of demarcation is obliterated. Or, more fully, we may say that, even in Homer, there occur side by side, contemporaneously, survivals from all along the line of development from Indo-European separateness in form and usage to complete coalescence in form and confusion of usage. But an accidental identity in form should not lead us to confound constructions totally different in origin and nature. Accordingly, the genitives in Sophokles will be here divided into three classes, to be taken up in their order: first, true genitives; secondly, ablatival genitives; thirdly, genitives whose origin and development cannot at present be traced with certainty, or a high degree of probability. However, it is not to be overlooked that the first two classes run into the third perplexingly,—indeed, the third is in part a sort of catch-all for the remnants,—and that any two observers may differ here and there as to which way the fluctuating line of probability inclines. Furthermore, the prepositions, which occur with each class of genitives, will most conveniently be treated last.

II.

The true genitive is originally adnominal; that is, its primary function is to limit the meaning of a substantive. Its other functions have grown out of this by one extension after another, sometimes traceable, sometimes not. The case-ending may be said to denote merely that some relation exists between the genitive and its noun; the nature of that relation is in no sense expressed by the case-ending, but is determined wholly by the context and by the nature of the two things named. All this merely paraphrases the statement of Whitney (Sanskrit Gr., § 294): "The proper value of the genitive is adjectival; it belongs to and qualifies a noun, designating something belonging to the latter in a manner which the nature of the case, or the connection, defines more nearly."

In Sophokles, as elsewhere, this original adnominal genitive constitutes a very large and a fairly distinct class. When, however, we attempt to subdivide this class into genitives

subjective, objective, partitive, genitives of possession, material, specification, etc., we at once stumble upon perplexities. Let any one take a hundred consecutive examples from any writer and try to put each one in its appropriate pigeonhole. The partitions have to come out immediately. Many examples belong in two or three at once; more still will not fit any. The simple experiment proves the impossibility of making such subdivisions. The reason is that the relations actually subsisting between things connected in the genitive construction include about all the relations which ever subsist between separate entities. At any rate, those relations are so "flexible, changeable, vague, and multiform and doubtful," — to make a special application of Clough's words, — that any complete subdivision of the adnominal genitive on this basis is impracticable. All the varieties to which the grammars give separate names appear frequently in Sophokles, but statistics cannot be given. Nor, if possible, would such subdivision be of much profit. It would add nothing to our understanding of the nature of the case, little to our knowledge of the history of the case, nothing to our understanding of the thought of a Greek author. As to the last assertion let us examine illustrations in our own language. For nearly all the categories of the adnominal genitive laid down in the grammars may be perfectly illustrated by Shakespearian and other good English usage. Very brief search and consideration furnish the following examples.

Subjective genitive: "*Night's* predominance"; "*ruin's* wasteful entrance"; "without *my* stir"; "*his* present death"; "the *sun's* return." Objective genitive: "Fought against *my* captivity"; "every one did bear *thy* praises in his *kingdom's* great defence"; "labored in his *country's* wreck"; "in our *country's* purge"; "thy personal venture in the *rebels'* fight." Genitive of measure or value: "Grief of an *hour's* age"; "an *hour's* delay"; "a *fortnight's* space"; "a *moment's* hesitation"; "a *year's* time." Genitive of the whole: "The *house's* top"; "a tale *whose* lightest word"; "my *heart's* core." Genitive of specification: "*Sinai's* mount"; "*Nebo's* lonely mountain." Genitive of connection,

in family, state, etc.: "The *Norways'* king"; "*Bellona's* bridegroom"; "*John's* father, son," etc.

These and similar lists might be almost indefinitely extended, and the genitive of possession is too common to need mention. There are also an endless number of genitives which elude classification as absolutely as many in Greek. Note, for example, the following: "A *summer's* cloud"; "*heaven's* breath"; "this *night's* great business"; "each *day's* life"; "*life's* feast"; "my *sceptre's* awe." True, some of these and others like them may be forced into various categories; but such forcing is not classification. Surely, so far as pupils are concerned, no practical and sufficient end would be served by requiring them to attempt or think of any such dissection of the adnominal genitive in Shakespeare.[1] Then why in Sophokles? At most the terms "subjective," etc. can be useful only occasionally, in case of real ambiguity, as a convenient mode of indicating the actual meaning of the passage.

Under this simplest type of genitive, depending on a noun or pronoun, are included 46.3+ per cent of all the genitives in Sophokles, and 86.3+ per cent of the true genitives. The extensions and offshoots of this type, familiar as most of them are, common in all writers, and in great part pro-ethnic in origin, are thus seen to be comparatively infrequent.

We should expect in poetry some combinations of nouns in the genitive construction which would be strange in prose. The poet's preference for a concise mode of expression may lead him to select a genitive instead of a prepositional phrase or a clause. And in particular Sophokles's fondness for a somewhat artificial style, for a new and artistic rather than a familiar turn of words, tends to variations from prose usage. Hence we find examples like these: *κλέπτης αὐτοῦ ψηφοποιός*, Ai. 1135; *τόλμης πρόσωπον*, O. T. 533; *σχολῇ κακοῦ*, O. T. 1286; *λυγρῶν πόνων ἱκετῆρες*, O. T. 185; *ἄρρητ'*

[1] Of course, in giving English genitives, *of* has not been regarded as a genitive sign, any more than *ἀπό* or any other preposition would be so regarded in Greek.

ἀρρήτων, O. T. **465**; *δόκησις λόγων*, O. T. **681**; *μῆνιν πράγματος*, O. T. **699**; *θανάτων πύργος*, O. T. **1199**; *ἕδρας γῆς*; O. K. 45; *ὁ Θήβας ἐλελίχθων*, Ant. **153** (in which example the peculiarity lies merely in the fact that the participle is made a substantive); *νόσων φυγάς*, Ant. **364**; *μῦθος φίλων* ('talk about friends'), Ant. 11; *θρήνων ᾠδάς*, El. **88**; *στέρνων πληγάς*, El. **90**; *φάσμα νυκτός*, El. **501**; *τἀκείνου σωτήρια* ('means of safety proceeding from him'), El. 924; *ὠδῖνας αὐτοῦ* ('about him'), Tr. 42; *εὐμάρεια πόρου*, Phil. **704**.

Sometimes the noun with which the genitive is connected is omitted, or is continued from a preceding phrase, to which the genitive is joined by some conjunction, most often *ὡς*: e. g. *φρενός*, Ai. 482; *θεοῦ*, Ai. 998; *κώδωνος*, Ai. 17; *φεύγοντος*, Ant. 256. (It may be said here that this use of *ὡς*, *ὥσπερ*, *εἴπερ* appears several times in Sophokles connecting similar constructions under other classes of genitives.)

Sometimes, as in prose, the genitive is put alongside of a possessive adjective, as if agreeing with a genitive implied in that possessive: as, *θανόντος*, Ai. 1016; *μόνης*, Tr. 775.

Then there are many occurrences of the genitive dependent on a pronoun, as *τίς*, *τὶς*, *οὐδείς*, *μηδείς*, *ὅστις*, some form of the article followed by *μέν* or *δέ*, or even on the article alone in some survivals of its earlier pronominal use, or even, finally, on a pronoun understood. Most of these are simple enough, and common in prose and poetry of all periods. Examples are: *ἐν τῷ πράγματος*, Ai. 314; *ἐν τῷ συμφορᾶς*, Ant. 1229; *ὅστις ὑμῶν*, O. T. 224; *θεῶν του*, O. T. 42; *ἐς τοσοῦτον ἐλπίδων*, O. T. 771; *τοὐκεῖθεν ἄλσους*, O. K. 505.

A noun or pronoun, with a genitive dependent on it, may have an adjective in the superlative degree connected with it, either directly, as an attributive, or through a verb, as a predicate adjective, to denote that one individual or certain individuals of a class possess a quality in a higher degree than any others of the class. We may call this the genitive with superlatives; but it evidently belongs primarily with the noun or pronoun; and this even when the superlative itself, by omission of its noun, becomes a sub-

stantive. Examples of this sort, then, are to be classed as adnominal; and the case is the same with genitives accompanying a superlative adverb, the genitive depending on a noun or pronoun, expressed or understood, and the adverb belonging to a verb, adjective, or other adverb. The reason for here separating these examples from those just considered is that the grammars so separate them; and in fact the presence of the superlative marks the examples distinctly enough to justify the practice. In its nature prosaic, this construction appears but eighty-three times in the seven plays (2.0+ per cent of all, 3.8— per cent of true genitives), and lyric lines furnish less than their quota. Indeed, the genitive with a superlative adverb nowhere occurs in lyric metre. A few examples are cited: *στρατοῦ*, Ai. 502; *πημονῶν*, O. T. 1230; *τῶνδε*, Tr. 312. In two instances the genitive with superlatives is probably to be regarded as ablatival, of the same nature as the genitive with comparatives, and is counted under that head. The examples are *τῶν προτέρων*, Ant. **100** ff.; *τῶν ἐντόπων*, Phil. **1171**.

A number of common adverbs retain enough of their earlier force as nouns to admit, in dependence on them, a genitive of the whole. There occur in Sophokles thirty-four adnominal genitives of this description (0.8+ per cent of all, 1.6— per cent of true genitives) with the adverbs *ἄλλῃ*, *ἔνθα*, *ἐνθάδε*, *ἵνα*, *μηδαμοῦ* (?), *οἱ*, *οἵπερ*, *ὅποι*, *ποῖ*, *ποῦ*, *πού*, *ὡς*. E.g., with *ἄλλῃ*, Tr. 906; with *ἔνθα*, Ai. 659; with *ἐνθάδε*, Phil. 899; with *ἵνα*, O. T. 367 and 413; with *μηδαμοῦ*, [Phil. 256]; with *οἱ*, El. 1035; with *οἵπερ*, El. 404; with *ὅποι*, El. 922; with *ποῖ*, O. T. **1309**; with *ποῦ*, Ai. 102; with *πού*, Phil. **1124**; with *ὡς*, O. T. 345.

The adnominal genitive is used by Sophokles in the predicate with the verbs *εἰμί*, *γίγνομαι*, *νομίζομαι*, *ὀνομάζομαι*, *ἐπονομάζομαι*, *φαίνομαι*, *γράφομαι*, *καλοῦμαι*, *ἐπακούω*, *ποιοῦμαι*, *κυρῶ*, *ὄπωπα*, *εἶπον*, *ὑπάρχει* (?), *αὐδῶμαι*. Of these *εἰμί*, as everywhere, is the most common. The following are the examples with the other verbs: *ὁ νοῦς ὅταν | αὑτοῦ γένηται*, O. K. 660; *πατρὸς | ἄλλου γενοῦ του*, Tr. 1205. In Phil. 305 f., *πολλὰ γὰρ τάδε | ἐν τῷ μακρῷ γένοιτ' ἂν ἀνθρώπων*

χρόνῳ, ἀνθρώπων is commonly taken with χρόνῳ. But the objection of Blaydes, quoted with approval by Nauck, that with ἀνθρώπων we should expect βίῳ rather than χρόνῳ is well founded; and in reading ἀνθρώπῳ Blaydes at least gives the meaning of the passage, which is, 'Many events of this sort might in the long stretch of time fall to the lot of men.' But why not retain ἀνθρώπων as a predicate genitive after γένοιτο, which stands close beside it? Although the idea is ordinarily expressed by γίγνομαι with the dative, yet the predicate genitive is not unnatural in itself, and is no more unparalleled than ὅταν αὑτοῦ γένηται, O. K. 660, in the sense of 'become master of itself,' or 'come to itself.' It is certainly less hard to explain thus than to put ἀνθρώπων with χρόνῳ. τοῦ θεῶν νομίζεται, O. K. 38; οὐ τοῦ κρατοῦντος ἡ πόλις νομίζεται, Ant. 738; ὁ τῆς ἀρίστης μητρὸς ὠνομασμένος, Tr. 1105; πατρὸς | τὴν δυστάλαιναν δαΐτ' ἐπωνομασμένην, El. 283; ὡς οὐκέτ' ὄντος γὰρ συμβόλαιά σου | ἐφαίνετο, Phil. 884; τὸν ἐκ θεῶν | φανέντ' ἄναγνον καὶ γένους [τοῦ Λαΐου], O. T. 1383. This example is not included in the count, for the text cannot possibly be right, whatever be the true correction. οὐ Κρέοντος προστάτου γεγράψομαι, O. T. 411; Παλλάδος καλούμεναι | Ἀθῆναι, O. K. 107; καλοῦ τῆς μητρός, El. 367; οἷον ἐγὼ γᾶς Ἀσίας οὐκ ἐπακούω, O. K. 695; ποιοῦ σεαυτῆς, Ant. 547; ἀδελφῆς . . . | κυρεῖ, Ant. 486; ὁποῖον οὐ | τῶν σῶν τε κἀμῶν οὐκ ὄπωπ' ἐγὼ κακῶν, Ant. 6; ποίας ὑμᾶς πατρίδος ἢ γένους εἰπών, Phil. 222; σχῆμα Ἑλλάδος | [στολῆς ὑπάρχει], Phil. 223; οἶσθα γὰρ ὧν αὐδῶμαι, Phil. 852.

There are in addition nine passages, furnishing fourteen genitives, which require fuller consideration. The genitives are certainly adnominal in origin, and may best be treated in connection with the predicate genitive. The passages are as follows: ποίου κέκραγας ἀνδρὸς ὧδ' ὑπέρφρονα; | ποῦ βάντος ἢ ποῦ στάντος οὔπερ οὐκ ἐγώ; Ai. 1236 f.; ποίου γὰρ ἀνδρὸς τήνδε μηνύει τύχην; O. T. 102; μαντεῖα | ἃ τοῦδ' ἐχρήσθη σώματος, O. K. 355; κεἰ δεῖν' ἐπερρώσθη λέγειν | τῆς σῆς ἀρωγῆς, O. K. 662; τοῦ κασιγνήτου τί φής, | ἥξοντος ἢ μέλλοντος; El. 317; τοῦ με τήνδ' ἐφίστασαι βάσιν; Tr. 339; τῷ παιδὶ φράζω τῆς τεχνωμένης τάδε, Tr. 928;

τῆς μητρὸς ἥκω τῆς ἐμῆς φράσων ἐν οἷς | νῦν ἔστιν, Tr. 1122; *Φ. ἀναξίου μὲν φωτὸς ἐξερήσομαι, | γλώσσῃ δὲ δεινοῦ καὶ σοφοῦ, τί νῦν κυρεῖ. Ν. ποίου δὲ τούτου πλήν γ' Ὀδυσσέως ἐρεῖς;* Phil. 439 ff.

In all these except Tr. 339 the meaning is just about what would be expressed were *περί* used; but no one would now explain them by saying *λείπει περί*, or, in Tr. 339, *λείπει ἕνεκα*. Nor is it quite satisfactory to say that *ποίου ἀνδρός*, for instance, depends directly on *ὑπέρφρονα*, still less on *κέκραγας*. Is not a clue to the right explanation to be found in such varieties of the predicate genitive as *πατρίδος*, Phil. 222; *κακῶν*, Ant. 6; *γᾶς*, O. K. **695**, quoted above? Then compare with these such expressions as *τί τόδε λέγεις;* or *οἷόν τι ποτὸν τόδε νηῦς ἐκεκεύθει*, Hom. *ι* 348, showing a not infrequent predicate accusative. In the nine passages above quoted, the genitive is to be regarded as a development of the predicate genitive; and the force of Ai. 1236 may be roughly given thus: 'What sort of a man is he with whose name you clamorously connect such haughty words?' So O. T. 102 might be rendered, 'Whose does he, by his announcement, declare this fate to be?' So O. K. 355, 'Prophecies which were, by utterance of the oracle, declared as mine,' i.e. 'as having reference to me.' In like manner the other passages might be rendered. In each instance, except Tr. 339, we have a verb of declaring, a direct object (or with the passive a subject), and a genitive, which in several instances does not stand very near the object. In O. K. 355, and in some others, the genitive might perhaps be regarded as connected directly with the noun or pronoun; but in Ai. 1236 and O. T. 102 the genitive cannot be so construed; and the examples all seem to belong together. The most doubtful ones are Tr. 1122 and Phil. 439, where it is difficult to say with certainty that the genitive does not depend directly on the indirect question. Then in Tr. 339 it is difficult to say whether a still further extension of the idiom has taken place, in that the verb of declaring is only implied, or the genitive should be taken to modify the rest of the sentence as a whole. This genitive seems to be a good deal like the geni-

tive of price, which also is probably a development of the predicate genitive. And besides, in most of the passages under consideration the genitive has come to have the aspect of an adverbial modifier of the predicate, and from being so regarded may well have been used in connections which completely obscured the origin of the locution. In other words, we may have here instances of the beginnings of a distinct function of the genitive.

With these apparently belong seven examples of the genitive with verbs of hearing and learning (i. e. having something told one), where the genitive is to be translated *about*. They are: *τούτων ἀκοῦσαι*, O. K. 485; *κλύων σοῦ*, O. K. 307; *κλύουσαν | ὀνειράτων*, El. **481**; *κλύουσα παιδός*, Ant. 1182; *ἔραμαι πυθέσθαι . . . τᾶς δειλαίας . . . | ἀλγηδόνος*, O. K. **514**; *ὧν πεύσει*, El. 35; *σὲ πατρὸς οὕτω δαρὸν ἐξενωμένον | τὸ μὴ πυθέσθαι ποῦ ἔστιν αἰσχύνην φέρειν*, Tr. 65. This genitive is certainly more nearly akin to those discussed immediately above, than it is to the common genitive of the thing heard with these and like verbs.

Another special development of the predicate adnominal genitive is the genitive denoting the place or time within the limits of which an action takes place. These idioms evidently belong together, and are to be compared with Homeric *ἑσπέριοι ἀφίκοντο, εὖδον παννύχιοι, παλίνορσος ἀπέστη, ἄψορροι ἀπονέοντο*, etc. The type is marked by Delbrück[1] as proethnic, and it throws light on the idioms discussed immediately above. The Sophoklean examples are: *νυκτός*, Ai. 21, **141**, 285, El. 780, Phil. 606; *χρόνου*, O. K. 397, 821, El. **477**, 817, Tr. 173; *ἡμέρας*, El. 698; *θέρους*, Phil. 1340; *χειμῶνος*, Ai. 1143; *πεδίων*, O. K. **689**; *τοῦ προσωτάτω*, Ai. 731; *ἑρκέων*, Ai. 1274; *πυρᾶς*, El. 901. Among these seventeen examples, then, appear five expressions of time and four of place, although *νυκτός* and *χρόνου* are most frequent. In El. 901 *πυρᾶς* illustrates very clearly the predicative origin of the construction. No account has been taken of the common adverbs in *-ου*, which undoubtedly belong in the same category, case-forms petrified into adverbs.

[1] Syntakt. Forschungen, iv. p. 45.

The genitive absolute has advanced a step farther along the line of these predicate genitives; or rather, in most instances of the genitive absolute this farther step has been taken. For we may distinguish three stages: First, the genitive is so closely and directly connected with a noun that one might hesitate whether to call it adnominal or to call it absolute. For example, *οὗ δῆτα ποικίλως αὐδωμένου | δέχου τὰ συμφέροντα τῶν ἀεὶ λόγων*, Phil. 130 f. Secondly, it has the aspect of a predicate genitive similar to those of time and

TRUE GENITIVE.

		Ai.	O.T.	O.K.	Ant.	El.	Tr.	Phil.	Total.	Total.
With substantives and pronouns,	Dial.	158	220	280	167	211	203	186	1,425	1,895
	Lyr.	69	49	67	103	55	60	67	470	
With superlative adjectives,	Dial.	10	9	9	4	12	6	12	62	75
	Lyr.	1	2	3	4	1	2	0	13	
With superlative adverbs,	Dial.	2	2	1	0	2	1	0	8	8
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
With adverbs of time, etc.,	Dial.	4	5	1	1	9	6	2	28	34
	Lyr.	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	
In predicate,	Dial.	1	9	8	8	11	8	8	53	60
	Lyr.	0	0	3	0	0	0	4	7	
Predicate Genitive translated 'about' or 'because of,'	Dial.	3	1	4	1	4	3	2	18	20
	Lyr.	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	
Genitive of place and time,	Dial.	5	0	2	0	4	1	2	14	17
	Lyr.	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	
Genitive Absolute,	Dial.	11	16	11	6	10	14	6	74	84
	Lyr.	3	1	0	2	2	1	1	10	
Total,	Dial.	194	262	316	187	263	242	218	1,682	2,193
	Lyr.	74	53	76	109	60	64	75	511	
Total,		268	315	392	296	323	306	293	2,193	

23.3+ per cent are lyric.

place, as in El. 101 f., *οὐδεὶς τούτων οἶκτος φέρεται | σοῦ, πάτερ, οὕτως | . . . θανόντος.* Thirdly, this predicate genitive appears to modify the action as a whole, or the verb itself, giving vaguely a cause, condition, etc. of the main action. This last stage is that of most genitives absolute, and may be compared with Tr. 339, *τοῦ με τήνδ' ἐφίστασαι βάσιν;* The usage of Sophokles presents little that is peculiar or especially noteworthy. A few examples occur of a participle standing alone in the absolute construction; as, *τελουμένων,* El. 1344; *κατθανόντος,* Ant. 909.

The synopsis on the preceding page indicates the numbers and distribution of the classes of genitives thus far discussed.

III.

The Homeric uses of the ablatival genitive are nearly all retained by Sophokles, and still others are added. How far his peculiarities in this respect are due to his own invention, extending deliberately the range of certain types, and how far to fastidious choice of phrases from predecessors, cannot now be determined. Nor can we decide, without the statistics for other writers and periods, just how the usage of Sophokles compares with that of his contemporaries and predecessors. But certain it is that we find the ablatival genitive surprisingly well defined and numerously illustrated in his surviving plays. This genitive occurs mostly with verbs, to a considerable extent with verbs compounded with prepositions; but the preposition is seldom the essential governing element. The most convenient classification of the examples for our purpose will be, first, the genitive of separation; second, of source; third, of agent; fourth, of cause; fifth, of comparison; sixth, with compounds of *πρό.* As grammatical categories go, these are tolerably distinct, although connected as closely as the various meanings of the English *from.* Taking them up in order, the genitive of separation (including under that term departure, deprivation, failure, and the like) occurs with the following words and in the places noted. A few variations from the strict alphabetical order,

with compounds under their simple verbs when these latter occur, have been allowed for etymological reasons.

ἄγω, Phil. 613, 630; *ἀείρω*, Ant. 417; *ἀλύσκω*, Ant. 489, El. 626; *ἁμαρτάνω*, El. 1320, Phil. 231 (two; here the meaning is, virtually, 'to fail to receive from'); *ἀμπλακεῖν*, Ant. 554, 910, 1234; *ἀμύνω*, O. T. **894**; *ἀνακουφίζω*, O. T. 24; *ἀναπνέω*, Ai. 274 (cf. *ἐκπνέω*, and also Frag. 147 Dind., *οὐ μύρου πνέον*); *ἀνατίθημι*, Ai. 476 (articular inf.); *ἀνίημι* (cf. *ἀφίημι*, *μεθίημι*, *παρίημι*), O. T. 264, 265; *ἀπαΐσσω*, Ai. 448; *ἀπαλλάσσω* (cf. *ἐναλλάσσω*, *καταλλάσσω*), O. K. 786, Ant. 400, 769, El. 783, 1335, 1336; *ἀπαράσσω*, Tr. **1016**; *ἀπατάω*, Ai. 807; *ἀπαυδάω*, O. T. 236; *ἄπειμι* (*εἰμί*), Ant. 1170, Tr. 165; *ἄπειμι* (*εἶμι*, cf. also *ἔξειμι*, *βαίνω*, *μολεῖν*, etc.), O. T. 229, 431 (where *ἀποστραφείς* is added); *ἀπορέω*, Phil. 898; *ἀποσκεδάννυμι*, O. T. 138; *ἀποβλάπτω*, Ai. 941; *ἀποσπάω*, Ai. 1025, 1176, O. T. 1432, O. K. 895, El. 809; *ἀποστάζω*, Ant. **959** (cf. Frag. 342 Dind., *κεραυνίου | νώτου καταστάζοντα φάρος*, 'letting slip down, droop, from'); *ἀποστατέω*, O. T. 743, Ant. 993; *ἀποστέλλω*, El. 71; *ἀποσυλάω*, see *ἐξωθέω*; *ἀπωθέω* (cf. *ἐξωθέω*), Ai. 446, O. T. 233, 234, 641, 670, El. 1325; *ἀφίημι* (cf. *ἀνίημι*, etc.), O. T. 1521, Ant. 1085 (the last passage is variously construed, some editors, with the Scholiast, explaining *καρδίας* as = *κατὰ καρδίας*, others putting *καρδίας* with *τοξεύματα*; Nauck makes it ablatival); *ἐξαφίημι*, Tr. 72; *ἀφορμάομαι*, O. K. 1401; *ἀτιμάζω*, O. K. 50, Ant. 21 (cf. *ἄτιμος*, O. T. 789).

βαίνω (cf. *μολεῖν* and *ἔρχομαι*), O. T. **152**, O. K. **226** (with *ἔξω πόρσω* added); *ἀποβαίνω*, O. K. **167**; *ἐκβαίνω*, Ai. **892**; *ἐπιβαίνω*, Phil. **194**; *βάλλω*, O. T. 622 (with *ἔξω* added). In regard to this and similar examples, where *ἔξω* is added, it is not easy to say whether the genitive is "governed" by the verb or by *ἔξω*. In their origin, of course, the prototypes of such phrases contained an ablative modifying the verb; the question now is, with which the poet, in thought, would have connected the genitive. From the freedom with which Sophokles uses the ablatival genitive with simple verbs of motion, it appears on the whole more probable that *ἔξω* was secondary in his mind. *ἐκβάλλω*, Ai. 808, O. K. 1307, El. 648.

δεῖ, O. T. 394, 406, Ant. 1098, El. 612, 1494, Phil. 647, 1049, 1060; δεῖται, O. T. 1148, 1292 (two), O. K. 1170 (two); δέχομαι, O. T. 1163, 1164.

ἐκβιάζω, Phil. **1129**; ἔκκειμαι, Ant. 1011; ἐκκυλίνδω, O. T. 812; ἐκπλέω, Phil. 1375; ἐκπνέω (cf. ἀναπνέω), Ai. 1148; ἐκραίνω (?), Tr. 781; ἐκρίπτω, O. T. 1410 (?) (with ἔξω added, cf. what is said under βάλλω, above), El. **510**; ἔκτοπος (cf. compounds of *alpha privative*), O. K. **232**; ἐκτρέπομαι, O. T. 851; ἐξαιτέω, Tr. 10; ἔξειμι (εἶμι, cf. ἄπειμι), O. K. 909; ἐξοδοιπορέω, El. 20; ἐξωθέω (cf. ἀπωθέω), O. K. 428, 1296, 1330 (κἀπεσύλησεν is added); εἴργω, O. K. **836**, Ant. 48; ἀπείργω, Ai. 51; ἐλαύνω, O. T. 97; ἀπελαύνω, O. K. 599; ἐξελαύνω, O. K. 356, 376, 823; ἑλεῖν (cf. λαμβάνω), O. T. 1522; ἀνελεῖν, O. T. 1035, El. 1139; ἐξελεῖν, O. K. **541**; ἐναλλάσσω (cf. ἀπαλλάσσω and καταλλάσσω), Ai. **208**; ἔρημος, O. T. 57, 1509, O. K. **1719**, El. 1405; ἐρύκω, Tr. **131**; ἐρυστός, Ai. 730; (ἔρχομαι, Frag. 675 Dind., μικροῦ δ' ἀγῶνος οὐ μέγ' ἔρχεται κλέος; cf. O. K. 572, γῆς ὁποίας ἦλθον, which is not counted because of the proximity of ἀπό in the previous line, although perhaps it should have been;) ἀπέρχομαι, O. K. 1165; ἐξέρχομαι, O. K. 45, El. 777; ἔχω, El. 375 (O. K. 1618, an example which, like that in O. K. 572, is not counted, because of ἐξ in the previous line); ἀνέχω, O. T. 174.

ἵστημι, O. T. 142; ἀφίστημι, El. 776 (two), 912, Phil. 865; ἐξανίστημι, Ant. 297; ἐξίστημι, Ant. 1105; μεθίστημι, Phil. 463.

καταλλάσσω (cf. ἀπαλλάσσω and ἐναλλάσσω), Ai. 744; κενός, O. K. 931, Ant. 756, El. 403; κηκίω, Phil. **696** (cf. **784** f. ἐκ βυθοῦ | κηκῖον); κομίζω, O. T. 580, O. K. 1412; κρεμαστὸς (αὐχένος), Ant. 1221; κτάομαι, Phil. 1371; κυρέω, O. K. 1290 (two; ἀπό, line 1289, would be still in the listener's mind); κύρω, O. K. **1082** (?).

λαμβάνω, O. T. 1004, 1012, **1349**; λείπω, Ai. 543, Ant. 548, El. **474**, Tr. 266, 936; ἀπολείπω, El. 1169; λοιπός, El. 1127; λήγω, (Ai. 274, counted under ἀναπνέω,) O. K. 346, **1722**, El. **104** (two), 353, 379, Tr. 911, Phil. 1395; λύω, Tr. 181; ἐκλύω, O. T. 1002; λωφάω, Ai. 61.

μαλάσσω, Phil. 1334; μεθίημι (cf. ἀνίημι, etc.), Ai. **372**,

O. K. 838; *μεταγιγνώσκω*, Ai. **717** (two); *μολεῖν*, El. 908; *μόνος*, Ai. 511, *μοῦνος*, O. K. 1250.

νοσφίζω, Phil. 1427; *ἀπονοσφίζω*, Phil. 979.

ὁρίζω, Phil. 636; *ὀρφανός*, Ant. 425; *ὀρφανίζω*, Tr. 942.

παρίημι (cf. *ἀνίημι*, etc.), O. K. **1212**; *παύω*, Ai. 788, El. 798, Phil. 1379, 1424; *ἀναπαύω*, O. K. 1114; *ἀποπαύω*, Ai. **1205**; *πέμπω*, O. T. 1518 (*ἄποικον* perhaps has some influence); *ἐκπέμπω*, O. T. 309, 951, El. 1130 (?); *πίπτω*, Phil. 1002 (Schol. *ἄνωθεν πεσὼν ἀπὸ πέτρας*; Wecklein-Wunder also connect *πέτρας* directly with *πεσών*); *ἐκπίπτω*, Ai. 1177, O. K. 766, El. 750; *περάω*, O. T. 674. (*πνέω*, Frag. 147 Dind., *οὐ μύρου πνέον.*)

ῥιζόω, O. K. 1591 (with *γῆθεν*).

(*σπένδω*, Frag. 49 Dind., *ἔσπεισα βαιᾶς κύλικος*); *στείχω*, Ant. 10. After observing the use of the ablatival genitive with *μολεῖν*, *ἔρχομαι*, *ἐλθεῖν*, *βαίνω*, there seems no just ground for objecting to the same syntax with *στείχω*. *στερέω*, Ai. 511, O. K. 857, 1443, Ant. 13, 574, 890, El. 1210, Tr. 177; *ἀποστερέω*, O. T. 1379, El. 813, 814; *ἀποστερίσκω*, O. K. 375; *σφάλλω*, Tr. 1113; *σῴζω*, Ant. 1162, Phil. 919; *ἀνασῴζω*, El. 1133; *ἀποσῴζω*, Phil. 1379.

τήκομαι, Ant. 1008; *τητάομαι*, O. K. 1200, 1618, El. 1326, Phil. 228, 383; *τυγχάνω*, O. K. 1168, Phil. 1315.

(*ὑφαιρέω*, Frag. 34 Dind., *ὑφῃρέθη σοῦ κάλαμος ὡσπερεὶ λύρας.*)

φέρω, El. 324; *φεύγω*, O. K. 1024, Phil. 1044; *φυλάσσω*, O. K. **161**.

ψεύδω, Ai. 1382, Tr. 713.

Here belong also a number of genitives with adjectives having *alpha privative* as their first and most important element. In these cases the compound is a more picturesque or more suggestive substitute for an adjective of want, and is construed accordingly. As the second element is more or less prominent the construction shades off into the ablatival genitive of agent, or into the "objective" genitive with adjectives containing more or less of verbal force. Of the following, which are here classed under this head of separation, a few might perhaps be put under the genitive of agent. It is not

important to fix the exact dividing line between two classes which shade into each other so naturally. In none of this list does it seem necessary to consider the genitive "objective."

ἄγευστος κακῶν, Ant. **582**; *ἀκραιφνεῖς τῶν κατηπειλημένων,* O. K. 1147; *ἀλαμπὲς ἡλίου,* Tr. 691; *ἄλυπος ἄτης,* El. 1002, *γήρως,* O. K. 1519; *ἄμμορος πάντων,* Phil. **182**; *ἄμοιρος ταφῆς,* Ai. 1326, *τῶν θεῶν,* Ant. 1070; *ἄνατος κακῶν,* O. K. 786; *ἀνήλιον | ἀνήμεμόν τε | χειμώνων,* O. K. **678**; *ἀπάτωρ ἐμοῦ,* O. K. 1383 (cf. *ἄπαις ἔρσενος γόνου,* Hdt., etc.); *ἄπειρος κακῶν,* Ant. 1191, *γνώμης,* Ant. 1250, *τῶνδε,* Tr. 309; (in O. T. **1094** f. the infinitives *αὔξειν* and *χορεύεσθαι* depend on *ἄπειρος* in **1088**, but are not counted here, because without the article;) *ἄποπτος ἄστεως,* O. T. 762, *ἡμῶν,* El. 1489; *ἄπυρον ἀκτῖνός τ' ἀεὶ | θερμῆς ἄθικτον,* Tr. 685; *γόων οὐκ ἀσήμονες φθόγγοι,* O. K. 1668; *ἄσκευον ἀσπίδων τε καὶ στρατοῦ,* El. 36; *ἄτιμος τοῦ τεθνηκότος,* El. 1214, *οὐδενός,* El. 1215, *ὧν μὲν ἱκόμην | ἄτιμον,* O. T. 788; *ἄχαλκος ἀσπίδων,* O. T. **190**; *ἀψόφητος κωκυμάτων,* Ai. 321.

We must add to these the following examples, wherein one cannot say to which of two words the genitive belongs; it rather belongs to both, or to the phrase as a whole. *κυνῆς ἅλμα κουφιεῖν,* Ai. 1287; *ἀπωστὸς γῆς ἀπορριφθήσομαι,* Ai. 1019; *ἄφορμος ἐμᾶς χθονὸς ἔκθορε,* O. K. **233**; *δράμημα νωτίσαι πάτρας | ἄπουρον,* O. T. **192**; *ἔλαμψε γὰρ τοῦ νιφόεντος ἀρτίως φανεῖσα | φάμα Παρνασοῦ,* O. T. **475**; *ὅπως | σοῦ πρὸς δόμους ἐλθόντος εὖ πράξαιμί τι,* O. T. 1006. This is said by the *ἄγγελος* with evident reference to the words of Oedipus two lines above, *χάριν λάβοις ἐμοῦ*; hence *σοῦ* is to be taken as ablatival, with the idea of receiving a present in the euphemism *εὖ πράξαιμί τι.* So Wecklein-Wunder also, as appears from the comment, "Bene Ed. Oxon. 'ut a te beneficii aliquid consequerer.'" For a somewhat similar turn of words see Tr. 191, *πρὸς σοῦ τι κερδάναιμι.*

Several interesting facts are brought out by these lists of examples. In general, the freedom with which this genitive of separation is used with all sorts of words and expressions denoting removal, issue, deprivation, distinction, separation, receiving, is surprising. No one word occurs many times with

it; the number is not swelled by a few frequent phrases. Apparently Sophokles felt free to indicate these relations by the genitive with almost any word; so that, although many compounds of *ἀπό* and *ἐξ* appear in the lists, especially with verbs of motion, yet enough simple verbs of motion are so construed to show that the poet scarcely felt it necessary to help out such phrases with *ἀπό* or *ἐξ*, or any other preposition. Metre or euphony often seems to determine whether simple or compound shall be used. See e. g. under *λείπω*. Accordingly, where the only objection to a MS. reading is the presence of an ablatival genitive of separation, that reading should without hesitation be retained. Passages to be considered with this principle in view are *ἕλῃ μου*, O. T. 1522, and *ἀνδρῶν μοῦνος*, O. K. 1250, where the genitive offers no difficulty.

Obviously some of the examples enumerated above — namely, those with verbs of receiving — might with some propriety be classed under the head of source; but without strongly objecting to such disposal of them, it seems better for our purpose to reserve the term "genitive of source" to include the genitive with two classes of verbs: first, those of hearing and learning; secondly, verbs denoting birth. These verbs, with references, are the following: —

(*a.*) *ἀκούω*, O. T. 42, 547, 729, 841, O. K. 33, 452, 551, 1171, 1352, El. 926, 927, Tr. 431; *εἰσακούω*, Ai. 318, Tr. 424.

κλύω, Ai. 1072, O. T. 235, 305, O. K. 412, 413, 792, 1117, 1350, **1766** (possibly adnominal; here classed as ablatival, first, because so far from *ταῦτα*, secondly, because with these verbs the genitive usually denotes source when referring to persons, if the accusative of the thing accompanies it), El. 293, 424, 877, Tr. 189, Phil. 1273.

μανθάνω, Ai. 800, 801, O. T. 546, 574, 575, O. K. 593, Ant. 723, 725, 1032, El. 565, 889, Tr. 187, 408; *ἐκμανθάνω*, O. T. 1438 (not governed by *ἐκ*, cf. 1443), O. K. 114.

εἰδέναι, El. 668. Possibly this genitive goes with *χρῄζω*; but, first, the order indicates otherwise; secondly, compare O. K. 1149, *ἃ γ' εἴσει καὐτὸς ἐκ ταύταιν*; finally, when this verb means 'to learn,' as here and in El. 40, and else-

where not infrequently, why should it not be construed like *μανθάνω*?

πυνθάνομαι, O. T. 333, Tr. 387.

(*b.*) *γίγνομαι*, O. T. 1168, El. 775, Phil. **181**, 1284.

φύω, O. T. 1015, 1082, O. K. 1378, Ant. 38, **144**, **145**, **866**, El. 1171 (also Frag. 470 Dind., *θνητῆς φύς*); *ἐκφύω*, Ai. 487, 488, 1295, O. T. 1499.

φυτεύω, O. K. 1324.

βλαστάνω, Tr. 403 (also Frag. 518 Dind.); *ἀποβλαστάνω*, O. K. **534**.

O. T. 1063 may be added, *οὐδ' ἐὰν τρίτης ἐγὼ | μητρὸς φανῶ τρίδουλος*, where the case seems to hover between the adnominal and ablatival genitive, with the idea of source the more prominent.

Under this head belong also a few examples in which the genitive of source, without a preposition, is employed to denote the agent. The following appear in Sophokles: *ἄφαρκτος φίλων*, Ai. **910**; *τῶν φίλων νικώμενος*, Ai. 1353; *ἄθικτος ἡγητῆρος*, O. K. 1521; *κακῶν | δυσάλωτος*, O. K. **1722**; *φίλων ἄκλαυτος*, Ant. **848**; *μαντικῆς ἄπρακτος*, Ant. 1034; *κείνης διδακτά*, El. 344; *ἐκδιδαχθεὶς τῶν κατ' οἶκον* [Tr. 934]; *κρατίστου πατρὸς τραφείς*, Phil. 3 (cf. *οἷος ἐξ οἵου ἐτράφης*, Ai. 557; also *τραφεὶς μητρὸς εὐγενοῦς ἄπο*, Ai. 1229, and *μητέρων τεθραμμένοι*, Aesch. Sept. 792); *ἐλπίδων | ἄπιστον*, Phil. 867; *φωνῆς | προσφθεγκτός*, Phil. 1066.

As already remarked, some few of those placed under the genitive of separation with compounds of *alpha privative* may perhaps belong here instead. Thus Wunder, for example, agrees with Brunck in so disposing of *γήρως*, O. K. 1519.

The genitive is used to denote cause in exclamations in the following passages: with *οἴμοι*, Ai. **367**, **900**, **908**, 980, O. K. **202**, 982, 1399 (two), 1400, Ant. 82, **1265**, El. 1143 (with *τάλαινα*), 1179, 1209 (with *τάλαινα*), Tr. **971**, **972**; with *ἐή*, O. K. **149**; with *φεῦ*, El. 920, 1183.

With other words the genitive of cause is difficult to separate from genitives wholly doubtful in character. The following, however, seem to belong here: (*βαρυνθήσεσθε*, Frag. 627 Dind.); *ἐντρέπομαι*, Ai. 90, O. T. 724, 1226, El. 520; *κήδο-*

μαι, Ai. **204**, O. T. 1060, El. **1059**, 1327; *προκήδομαι*, Ant. 741, Tr. **965**; *ὀνίναμαι*, Tr. 570; *ἀπονίναμαι*, El. **211**; *αὔξω*, O. K. **1565**; *δείλαιος*, O. T. 1347 (two); *ἐπιμέμφομαι*, Tr. **112**; *εὐδαιμονίζω*, O. K. **144** (?); *ζηλῶ*, El. 1027; *ἥδομαι*, Phil. **715**. In this passage the genitive of cause appears instead of the more usual instrumental dative, which is seen, e. g., in O. T. 454. *κλαίω*, El. 1117; *σωτῆρα κλῄζει*, O. T. 48; *μηνίζω*, Ant. 1177 (?); *πορεύω*, Tr. 560; *στρέφομαι*, Ai. 1116; *στυγῶ*, El. 1027. In O. T. 1478 the genitive *τῆσδε τῆς ὁδοῦ* gives the cause of the entire wish expressed in the next line. In O. K. 1506, on the other hand, *τῆσδε τῆς ὁδοῦ* is decidedly better construed with *τύχην*, as Nauck explains.

Better in this connection than elsewhere may be enumerated the occurrences of the genitive with compounds of *πρό*, in which the preposition really determines the case. These genitives are ablatival in origin, and somewhat like those of cause. The verbs, with references, are the following: *προέχω*, Ant. 208, O. T. 1115, Phil. **138**; *προΐστημι*, Ai. 803, El. 980; *προκάμνω*, Ai. 1269; *πρόκειμαι*, Tr. 925; *προκηραίνω*, Tr. 29; *προσκοπέω*, Ant. 688; *προταρβέω*, Ant. 83; *προτίθημι*, O. K. 419.

Lastly, the genitive of comparison with adjectives in the comparative degree is so common in prose, and in Sophokles presents so little that is peculiar, that few words need be added to the statistics of the table. In El. **155**, however, *περισσά* takes the genitive like a comparative, as does also *ἀλλοκότῳ* in Phil. **1191** f.; in Ant. 678, *ἡσσητέα*, as in prose, is construed like its primitive, *ἥσσων*. So *ἡσσῶνται τέκνων*, Frag. 674 *a* Dind. In Ai. 1357 the genitive is used because of the comparative idea in the phrase *νικᾷ πολύ*, and there seems to be no ground for suspecting the text. With this should be compared Phil. **1100**, *τοῦ λῴονος δαίμονος εἵλου τὸ κάκιον αἱνεῖν*, where *τοῦ λῴονος* depends on the comparative idea in *εἵλου*. Here also are to be counted the two genitives with superlatives mentioned above: *τὸ κάλ-|λιστον . . . | τῶν προτέρων φάος*, Ant. **100** ff.; *λῷστε τῶν πρὶν ἐντόπων*, Phil. **1171**.

The following table gives a summary.

ABLATIVAL GENITIVE.

		Ai.	O. T.	O. K.	Ant.	El.	Tr.	Phil.	Total.	Total.
Genitive of Separation,	Dial.	24	44	39	29	40	14	26	216	252
	Lyr.	6	6	12	2	4	2	4	36	
Genitive of Source,	Dial.	7	16	14	4	10	7	2	60	66
	Lyr.	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	6	
Genitive of Agent,	Dial.	1	0	1	1	1	[1]	3	8	11
	Lyr.	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	
Genitive of Cause,	Dial.	3	7	4	3	10	1	0	28	44
	Lyr.	4	0	4	1	2	4	1	16	
With compounds of πρό,	Dial	2	1	1	3	1	2	0	10	11
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Genitive of Comparison,	Dial.	7	12	5	14	10	2	6	56	72
	Lyr.	[1]	4	1	2	3	0	5	16	
Total,	Dial.	44	80	64	54	72	27	37	378	456
	Lyr.	12	10	20	9	9	6	12	78	
Total,		56	90	84	63	81	33	49	456	
17.1+ per cent Lyric.										

IV.

No attempt is here made to trace or discuss the true nature of the genitives brought forward in this chapter. Many of them are pretty certainly adnominal in origin, most of the remainder are probably so. But the history of most of them is obscure, extending back to pre-Homeric, and in some cases to pro-ethnic times. The endeavor to trace their development would therefore lead far, and would probably produce results of little positive value. Without a wide acquaintance with early Indo-European speech, such an endeavor would be well-nigh wasted. And finally, notwithstanding the space required to describe them in the grammars, the actual number of these genitives is comparatively small, — less than that of genitives

adnominal, ablatival, or with prepositions. The purpose of this paper is primarily to present a clear view of the Sophoklean usage; to this end the classification of the revised Hadley's Grammar will be followed, with some modifications made necessary by the classification adopted in the other chapters of this essay.

A. The genitive is used as object with the following classes of verbs: —

a. Verbs of sharing, under the general head of verbs whose action affects the object only in part (Hadley, 736, 737).

κοινόω, Tr. 546; *μέτεστι*, O. T. 630, O. K. 568, Ant. 1072; *μετέχω*, O. T. 1465, Ant. 534, El. 1168, Phil. 248; *ἔχω*, O. T. 709 (where *ἔχον* is about equivalent to *μέτεχον*, as Wunder points out, yet Ellendt approves Hermann's interpretation, "ex vatum arte pendere," making it ablatival); *συλλαμβάνω*, Phil. 281; *ξυμμετίσχω*, Ant. 537. (*δοῦσα* with partitive genitive occurs in Frag. 531 Dind.)

b. Verbs of touching, taking hold of, beginning (H. 738).

ἅπτομαι, O. K. 830 (two), 955 (?), 1550, Ant. 179, Tr. **1010**; *ἀνθάπτομαι*, Tr. 778; *ἐφάπτομαι*, Ai. 1172, O. K. 859; *ἄρχω*, Ai. **935**, Tr. 871 (cf. verbs of ruling); *κατάρχω*, O. K. 1019, Tr. 1135; *δράσσομαι*, Ant. 235; *ἐμβαίνω*, O. K. 400; *ἐπεμβαίνω*, O. K. 924; *ἐμβατεύω*, O. T. 825; *ἐπιβαίνω*, O. K. **189**, Phil. **1463**. If it is hard to separate this from compounds of *ἐπί*, it seems even harder to separate it from the three preceding words. *ἔχομαι*, O. T. **891** (?), O. K. 424 (cf. Frag. 325 Dind., *τοῦ κερδαίνειν | ἔχονται*, where Ellendt translates *ἔχονται* by *inhaerere;* also Frag. 26 Dind., *τοῦ δὲ κερδαίνειν ἔχου*); *θιγγάνω*, Ai. **1409**, O. T. 760, 1413, O. K. 328, 1133, Tr. 715, Phil. 407, 408, 762, 1398; *προσθιγγάνω*, O. K. **173**, Phil. 8 (two); *λαμβάνομαι*, O. K. 373 (two); *μάρπτω*, Tr. 779; *πελάζω*, Ai. **710**, **889**, O. T. **1100**, Phil. 1327; *ἐμπελάζω*, Tr. 17; *ψαύω*, O. T. 1464, O. K. 863, 1639, Ant. 857 (?), Tr. 904, **1007**; *ἐπιψαύω*, Ai. 1394, Phil. 669, 1255.

c. Verbs of aiming, reaching, attaining (H. 739).

ἀντάω, O. K. 1445; *ἀντιάω*, El. **869**, **870**; *ἵημι*, Ai. **154**, Tr. **514** (*ἑέμενοι*); *ἀφίημι*, Ant. 1084; *ἐφίεμαι*, El. **143**; *κιχάνω*,

O. K. 1487; *κυρέω*, O. T. 1513, Ant. **870**, El. **849**; *κύρω*, O. K. **247**, **1082**; [*λαγχάνω*, O. K. 450; see *τυγχάνω*;] *πειράομαι*, El. 468; *τοξεύω*, Ant. 1033, 1034; *τυγχάνω*, Ai. 527, 924, 967, O. T. 423, 677, 1435, 1449, 1450, O. K. 450 (MSS. give *λάχωσι*), 482, 780, **1482**, Ant. 465, 669, 699, El. 31, 364, 583, 963, 971, 992, 1469, 1488, Tr. 728, 1116, Phil. 618, **1091**, 1315; *προστυγχάνω*, El. 1463 (two), Phil. 552; *συντυγχάνω*, Phil. 321 (three).

d. Verbs of ruling and leading (H. 741).

ἀνάσσειν, Ai. 1100, 1101, 1102, O. T. **1104**; *ἄρχω*, Ai. **935**, 1068, 1107, O. T. 54, 579, O. K. 66, Ant. 525, 736, Tr. 443 (444 spurious), Phil. **860** (three); [*δεσπόζειν*, Tr. 363;] *ἡγοῦμαι*, Ai. 1106, El. 1038 (? *νῷν*); *κραίνω*, Ai. 1050, O. K. 296, 862, 926; *κρατέω*, Ai. 484, 1067, 1099, 1102, 1337, O. T. 55, 409, **1197**, O. K. 400, 405, 408, 646, 1207, 1385, Ant. **350**, El. 1175, Phil. 922, 989, 1048, 1292; *κρατύνω*, O. T. 14, Phil. 365, 1059, **1161**; *πρεσβεύων*, Ai. 1389; *στρατηγέω*, Ai. 1100; *τυραννεύω*, O. K. 449.

e. Verbs denoting an action of the senses or mind, — hear, taste, smell, remember, forget, care for, neglect, spare, desire (H. 742). Under this head, —

(1.) The following verbs of hearing.

αἰσθάνομαι, El. 78, 683; *ἐπαισθάνομαι*, O. K. 1351, Ant. 1183, Phil. 1295; *ἀΐω*, O. K. 304 (?), Phil. **1410**; *ἀκούω*, Ai. 335, 1070, O. T. 952, O. K. 418, 1187, El. 793, Phil. 225, 596; *ἀπακούω*, El. 81; *εἰσακούω*, Ai. 789, O. K. 1645, Tr. 351; *ἐπακούω*, O. T. 708, Phil. **1417**; *κλύω*, Ai. 291, 1162, 1352, O. T. 1472, O. K. 493, 740, 1173, 1176, 1406, 1642, Ant. 1206, El. 675, 1376, 1377, Tr. 414, 864, 1115, 1244, Phil. 632, **688**, 925, 976, 977.

Of these verbs, *ἀκούω*, *εἰσακούω*, and *κλύω*, as mentioned above, take also the genitive of source; and *ἀκούω* and *κλύω* appear with the genitive translated 'about,' classed as a development of the predicate adnominal. Furthermore, they are all construed, in Sophokles or elsewhere, with the accusative in precisely the same sense.

(2.) Two verbs of tasting.

γεύομαι, Ant. 1005, Tr. 1101; *πατέομαι*, Ant. 201.

(3.) Verbs of remembering and forgetting.

μιμνήσκω, O. T. 49, 564, 1401, O. K. 1361, 1555, El. 1252, Tr. 1223; *ἐπιμιμνήσκω*, Phil. 1407; *παραμιμνήσκω*, Tr. 1125; *λανθάνομαι*, El. **146**, **167**, **168**, 342, **1287**; *ἐκλανθάνομαι*, O. K. 1005.

(4.) Verbs of caring for, neglecting, and sparing.

μέλω, Ai. 689, 990, 1184, O. T. 1462, 1466, O. K. 1137, Ant. 1335, El. 342, Phil. 1036; *ἀκηδέω*, or, according to MSS., *ἀφειδέω*, Ant. 414; *ἀφειδέω*, El. 980; *φείδω*, Ai. 844, El. 716, Phil. 749.

(5.) Verbs of desiring.

ἐπαιτέω (*ὧν ἐπαιτεῖς*, 'what thou askest'), O. T. 1424; *ἐρῶ*, Ai. 686, Ant. 90, 1336, Tr. 551 (?); *κεχρημένοι*, Phil. 1264; *μαιμάω*, Ai. 50; *προσπίτνω*, O. K. **1755**; *χρῄζω*, Ai. 473, O. T. 597, 932, O. K. **1211**; *προσχρῄζω*, Phil. 1055.

f. Verbs of plenty (H. 743).

βρύω, O. K. 17 (three); *γέμω*, O. T. 4, 5 (two), Phil. 876 (two); *κορέννυμι*, Phil. **1157**; *μεστόω*, Ant. 280, El. 713; *πίμπλημι*, O. K. 480, 481 (two), Ant. **121**, El. 730, 906; *ὑπερπίμπλημι*, O. T. **874**; *στάζω*, El. 1423 (? *θυηλαῖς*).

g. With two verbs of exchanging occurs the genitive of price. *μεταβάλλομαι*, El. **1262**; *πρίασθαι*, Ai. 477.

h. *ἐπαιτιάομαι* with the genitive of the charge, Ant. 490.

i. *ἀξιόω*, the use of which with the genitive proceeds, of course, from that of *ἄξιος* with the same case (see *ἄξιος*, below), Phil. 62. *γελάω*, Phil. **1125**; Wunder, on Ai. 745, remarks the frequent use of simple instead of compound verbs, with the cases commonly taken by the compounds; as here, *γελᾷ* for *καταγελᾷ*.

j. Compounds in which the preposition governs the case. (Among these the genitive with compounds of *πρό* is evidently a development from the ablative-genitive with simple *πρό*; these compounds have already been given.)

ἀντέχω, O. K. 1651; *διαΐσσω*, Tr. 1083; *διαρροιζέω*, Tr. 568; *διελθεῖν*, Tr. 717; *διίημι*, O. K. 963; *ἐπιστρέφομαι*, O. T. 728, Phil. 598; *καθικέσθαι*, O. T. 809; *καθυβρίζω*, O. K. 960, 961 (two); *κατάφημι*, O. T. **505**; *κατηγορέω*, O. T. 514, 529; *ὑπεραλγέω*, Ant. **628**; *ὑπερδέδοικα*, Ant. 82; *ὑπερίστημι*, El. **188**;

ὑπερμάχομαι, Ai. 1346, O. T. 258 (two); *ὑπερπονέομαι*, Ai. 1310; *ὑπερφέρω*, O. T. 380.

k. In O. K. 436, *ἔρωτος τοῦδε ὠφελῶν* is too strange to be regarded as certainly what Sophokles wrote; Tr. 170 is probably not genuine; and *ὤν* in Tr. 548 is very doubtful. None of these are counted.

The following table gives a summary, without showing in detail the distribution of the examples, since the detailed numbers appear to have no special significance.

GENITIVE, NOT ABLATIVAL, WITH VERBS.

	Ai.	O. T.	O. K.	Ant.	El.	Tr.	Phil.	Total.	Total.
In Dialogue	35	40	59	25	30	23	39	251	299
Lyric	5	5	7	5	10	4	12	48	
Total	40	45	66	30	40	27	51	299	

16.1— per cent Lyric.

B. With adjectives — and a few adverbs derived from them — the genitive is used in various relations which are as difficult to classify as those of the adnominal genitive. A few of the adjectives thus accompanied in Sophokles are common elsewhere, and so perfectly familiar. But taking all the examples together, no classification appears to have much significance, either logical or historical; convenience of description and reference is all that is aimed at in setting them forth in the following four groups.

a. *αἴτιος*, O. K. 1298, El. 295, Tr. 773, Phil. 590, 1426; *μεταίτιος*, Tr. 261, 448 (two); *ἄξιος*, O. T. 778, 972, O. K. 905, El. 797; *ἀνάξιος*, Phil. 1009; *κατάξιος*, Phil. 1009; *ἀξίως*, El. 800, 801; *καταξίως*, O. K. 911 f. (three). (Cf. *ἀξιόω*.)

b. Adjectives of plenty and fulness. *ἀνάριθμος*, Ai. **601**, O. T. **179**, El. **232**, Tr. 247; *περιστεφής*, El. 896; *πλέως*, Ai. 745, 1112, 1150, O. K. 1162, Ant. 721, El. 607, 1405, Phil. 39, 1074; *πλήρης*, Ai. 307, O. K. 778, Ant. 1017, 1052, Phil. **1088**; *πολυστεφής*, O. T. 83.

c. Adjectives which have in common the possession of

more or less of verbal force, so that the genitive stands to the adjective as the object, in genitive, dative, or accusative, to a verb. Sometimes it is the first part of a compound, as in *σύμφωνος*, with which the genitive is most closely connected logically; sometimes the first part, as *alpha privative*, *ἐξ*, or *ἀπό*, negatives the phrase. *ἀδαής*, Phil. **827** (two); *ἀκόλουθος*, O. K. **719**; *ἄοκνος*, Ai. 563, Tr. **841**; *ἄπαρνος*, Ant. 435; *ἀρωγός*, Ai. **357**; *ἀταρβής*, Tr. 23; *ἀφόβητος*, O. T. 885; *ἄφωνος*, O. K. 865; *ἄψαυστος*, O. T. 969; *διάδοχος*, Phil. 867; *ἔκτιμος*, El. **241**; *ἐπήβολος*, Ant. 492; *ἐπίσκοπος*, Ai. 976 (?); *ἐπίσκιος*, O. K. 1650; *ἠθάς*, El. 373; *ἵδρις*, El. 608; *λυτήριος*, El. 447, 636; *μετάδρομος*, El. **1387**; *νομάς*, O. K. 687 (?); *ὁμόστολος*, O. T. **212**; *παυστήριος*, O. T. 150; *πρέπον*, Ai. 534; *πρόθυμος*, El. 3; *προμηθής*, El. **1078**; *προσήγορος*, O. T. 1437; *σύμφωνος*, O. T. 420.

d. Miscellaneous. *ἀμοιβός*, Ant. 1067; *ἀντίλυρος*, Tr. **643**; *ἔγκληρος*, O. K. 751, Ant. **813**; *ἐγκρατής*, Phil. 75; *ἐνάντιος*, Ai. 1283; *ἐπίκαιρος*, Ai. **1405**; *ἐπώνυμος*, O. T. **210**, O. K. 65, 1322; *ἰσόμοιρος*, El. **87**; *κύριος*, O. K. 1041; *λαθίπονος* (*ὀδυνᾶν*), Tr. **1021**; *ὕπαρχος*, Ai. 1105 (genitive of comparison?); *ὕπαυλος* (*σκηνῆς*), Ai. 796 (cf. *ὑπόστεγος*); *ὑπερτελής*, Tr. 36; *ὑπόστεγος* (*δωμάτων*), El. **1386** (cf. *ὕπαυλος*); *ὕπουλος* (*κάλλος κακῶν ὕπουλον*), O. T. 1396 (?); *φερέγγυος*, El. 942.

The adjectives *αἴτιος* and *ἄξιος*, with their compounds, chance not to occur in lyric lines. Adjectives of plenty constitute a fairly well-defined class, with which the genitive is frequent in all periods. But this class must certainly be separated from adjectives of want, with which the case is ablatival. In groups *c* and *d*, some of the constructions are bold extensions of ordinary or not rare usage. Such boldness in syntax is most likely to occur in lyric passages, and gives in these groups slightly more than the ordinary proportion of lyric references. The number of adjectives occurring but once with the genitive is noticeable. In these two latter groups also appear some adjectives which may perhaps equally well be taken as substantives. Thus El. **87**, *γῆς ἰσόμοιρ' ἀήρ*, is best understood as equivalent to 'air, earth's equally sharing partner in space,' and so 'coextensive with the earth.' In *λαθίπονος ὀδυνᾶν*, Tr. **1021**, *ὕπαυλος σκηνῆς*, Ai. 796, and *ὑπό-*

στεγος δωμάτων, El. **1386**, we find a compound of which the second member is a noun, followed by a genitive repeating the meaning of the noun. These are similar to some of the compounds of *alpha privative*, enumerated under the genitive of separation; yet in those the second element seems less prominent than in these three. The table gives a summary.

GENITIVE, NOT ABLATIVAL, WITH ADJECTIVES.

	Ai.	O. T.	O.K.	Ant.	El	Tr.	Phil.	Total.	Total.
In Dialogue	10	9	14	6	13	7	8	67	87
Lyric	3	3	1	1	6	3	3	20	
Total	13	12	15	7	19	10	11	87	
23.0 per cent Lyric.									

V.

There remain for consideration the genitives which occur with prepositions, proper and improper. Of those adverbs which, from their use with verbs, are strictly entitled to the name of prepositions, ἀπό, ἐξ, παρά, and πρός, when used with the genitive, can be clearly shown to express some *from*-relation. The genitive with them is distinctly ablatival. To these must be added πρό, whose variations in meaning all go back to *forth from* or *forward from*. The genitive with κατά in the phrase κατ' ἄκρας, which occurs thrice, is ablatival. This is the only phrase in Sophokles in which this preposition means *down from*. The character of other genitives with κατά is doubtful. As for ὑπό, there is no instance in Sophokles of its meaning *from under*, in the literal, local sense. When it denotes agency, the genitive is probably, but not demonstrably, ablatival; but it shades off perplexingly into the meanings *because of*, *under the influence of*, *accompanied by*, and locally *under*. It seems best, therefore, not to count it as governing the ablative-genitive.

In regard to most of the so-called improper prepositions it is difficult to decide with certainty which are construed with the genitive primarily because of some shade of *from*-relation,

and which are construed with the genitive merely because, when they came into familiar use, the genitive had already become the regular case to put with such adverbs. Nevertheless, it seems best to treat as governing an ablatival genitive ἄνευ, ἄπωθεν, ἄτερ, ἄτερθε, δίχα, ἐκτός, ἐκποδών, ἔξω, ἔξωθεν, λάθρᾳ, πάρος, πάροιθε, πέρα (πέραν), πλήν (originally a comparative), πρόσθεν, χωρίς. It is possible that ἔξω belongs with εἴσω, and should not be placed in the ablatival list; but it seems better to separate them as is here done, for the reason that ἔξω often occurs where actual motion *away from* or *out from* is indicated, and all its senses can be easily brought back to these, whereas all indications of an ablative with εἴσω are obliterated in Sophokles, if indeed they are to be found anywhere.

The following tables indicate the distribution and the total number of occurrences of the examples: —

ABLATIVAL GENITIVE WITH PREPOSITIONS.

		Ai.	O. T.	O. K.	Ant.	El.	Tr.	Phil.	Total.	Total.
ἀπό	Dial.	10	21	19	7	10	11	6	84	114
	Lyr.	5	6	4	0	2	6	7	30	
ἐξ	Dial.	22	47	39	37	47	40	40	272	306
	Lyr.	5	4	5	6	8	1	5	34	
παρά	Dial.	4	10	4	3	5	6	1	33	37
	Lyr.	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	4	
πρό	Dial.	0	2	4	2	0	0	1	9	14
	Lyr.	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	5	
πρός	Dial.	22	32	12	9	21	17	17	130	142
	Lyr.	0	3	3	2	1	0	3	12	
κατ' ἄκρας	Dial.	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3
	Lyr.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Total,	Dial.	58	112	78	59	83	75	65	530	616
	Lyr.	10	13	14	11	14	9	15	86	
Total,		68	125	92	70	97	84	80	616	

14.0— per cent Lyric.

ABLATIVAL GENITIVE WITH ADVERBS.

		Ai.	O. T.	O. K.	Ant.	El.	Tr.	Phil.	Total.	Total.
ἄνευ	Dial.	1	4	9	0	1	1	1	17	19
	Lyr.	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	
ἄπωθεν	Dial.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ἄτερ	Dial.	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	8	11
	Lyr.	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	
ἄτερθε	Dial.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Lyr.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
δίχα	Dial.	1	0	2	0	2	1	0	6	9
	Lyr.	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	
ἐκτός	Dial.	0	0	0	3	2	1	2	8	10
	Lyr.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
ἐκποδών	Dial.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ἔξω	Dial.	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	5	7
	Lyr.	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	
ἔξωθεν	Dial.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
λάθρᾳ	Dial.	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	4	4
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
πάρος	Dial.	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
πάροιθεν	Dial.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
πέρα(ν)	Dial.	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	5	6
	Lyr.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
πλήν	Dial.	2	1	1	0	3	0	2	9	10
	Lyr.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
πρόσθεν	Dial.	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	2
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
χωρίς	Dial.	1	2	0	1	1	0	3	8	11
	Lyr.	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	
Total,	Dial.	8	12	15	8	14	8	13	78	96
	Lyr.	4	0	3	5	2	1	3	18	
Total,		12	12	18	13	16	9	16	96	

18.5+ per cent are Lyric.

With other prepositions or quasi-prepositions the genitive is in its origin either adnominal or doubtful. Here more than

elsewhere the genitive and ablative have really coalesced, in some usages, into a single case.

The following tables exhibit the statistics, first for the true prepositions, secondly for the improper prepositions, used by Sophokles. It will be seen that several of these latter are Sophoklean *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*; also that *ἀμφί* probably occurs but once with the genitive (Phil. 554). *περί*, except in Ai. 151, always follows its case, and stands at the end of the line. *κατά*, *μετά*, and *ὑπέρ* do not occur in the Trachiniae.

GENITIVE WITH PREPOSITIONS, NOT ABLATIVAL.

		Ai.	O. T.	O.K.	Ant.	El.	Tr.	Phil.	Total.	Total.
ἀμφί	Dial.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ἀντί	Dial.	6	7	12	4	5	6	3	43	43
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
διά	Dial.	4	6	5	7	3	3	5	33	37
	Lyr.	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	
ἐπί	Dial.	2	4	9	2	2	1	3	23	33
	Lyr.	1	1	4	2	1	0	1	10	
κατά	Dial.	5	1	1	1	2	0	2	12	19
	Lyr.	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	7	
μετά	Dial.	1	5	3	3	2	0	6	20	25
	Lyr.	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	
περί	Dial.	2	3	1	4	3	2	2	17	19
	Lyr.	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
ὑπέρ	Dial.	3	8	2	3	2	0	2	20	32
	Lyr.	1	2	1	7	0	0	1	12	
ὑπό [*ὑπαί*]	Dial.	9	6	10	10	8	8	6	57	67
	Lyr.	4	0	1	0	1	1	3	10	
Total,	Dial.	32	40	43	34	27	20	30	226	276
	Lyr.	13	3	8	11	5	2	8	50	
Total,		45	43	51	45	32	22	38	276	

18+ per cent are Lyric.

GENITIVE WITH ADVERBS, NOT ABLATIVAL.

		Ai.	O. T.	O. K.	Ant.	El.	Tr.	Phil.	Total.	Total.
ἄγχι (ἆσσον)	Dial.	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	3
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ἀντίον	Dial.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
διαμπερές	Dial.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ἐγγυτέρω ἐγγυτάτω	Dial.	0	0	-τέρω	-τάτω	0	0	0	0	2
	Lyr.	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	
εἵνεκα	Dial.	5	7	3	3	6	1	2	27	27
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ἔνδον	Dial.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
	Lyr.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
ἔνδοθεν	Dial.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
εἴσω ἔσω	Dial.	1	2	0	0	1	3	1	8	9
	Lyr.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
ἕκατι	Dial.	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	3
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ἐναντίον	Dial.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ἔνερθεν	Dial.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
καθύπερθεν	Dial.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
κάτω	Dial.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
μεταξύ	Dial.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
[μέχρις]	Dial.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ὄπισθεν	Dial.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
πέλας	Dial.	0	3	3	1	1	0	0	8	8
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
πλησίον	Dial.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
	Lyr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total,	Dial.	8	13	10	5	10	8	6	60	66
	Lyr.	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	6	
Total,		9	14	11	6	12	8	6	66	

9.0+ per cent are Lyric.

VI.

Summing up the preceding tables, we obtain these figures: —

	Ai.	O. T.	O. K.	Ant.	El.	Tr.	Phil.	Total.
Total in Dialogue,	389	568	599	378	512	410	416	3272
Total in Lyric,	122	88	130	152	108	89	128	817
Total,	511	656	729	530	620	499	544	4089
Per cent in Lyric,	23.9—	13.4+	17.8+	28.7—	17.4+	17.8+	23.5+	20.0—

We find also the following facts: 53.6+ per cent are true genitives, 28.6 per cent are ablatival genitives, while only 17.8— per cent are to be classed as doubtful. And even if the reader insists on making some changes in the assignment to various classes, lessening somewhat the ablatival division, still the figures cannot be changed very greatly. That so large a proportion of ablatival constructions should survive the confusion of forms, is interesting, and even surprising. Certainly the grammars would never lead one to suspect the fact. The 28.6 per cent of ablatival genitives in Sophokles are made up of 2.4— with quasi-prepositions, 15.0+ per cent with true prepositions, and 11.2— per cent with verbs and adjectives, some of which contain a preposition which more or less influences the case. On the other hand, of the 17.8— per cent classed as doubtful, 1.6+ per cent are found with quasi-prepositions; 6.7+ per cent with true prepositions; 2.1+ per cent with adjectives; and 7.3— per cent with verbs. 21.8 per cent, therefore, of the whole number of genitives occur with prepositions proper, and 4.0 per cent with quasi-prepositions.

What other conclusions may be drawn from the statistics given in this paper must remain uncertain until these statistics can be compared with like figures for other writers and other periods. Those figures, so far as is known to the writer, are entirely wanting.